



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,933	01/07/2004	Peter M. Bonutti	2500DV2CN2DV3CN8	5806
7590	11/28/2007			
Patent Counsel United States Surgical, a division of TYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP LP 150 Glover Avenue Norwalk, CT 06856			EXAMINER THALER, MICHAEL H	
			ART UNIT 3731	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/752,933

Applicant(s)

BONUTTI, PETER M.

Examiner

Michael Thaler

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Oct. 15, 2007 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no basis in the original disclosure for the feature defined in claim 14 since neither the specification nor figure 9 indicates that relative movement between the cannula and the inflatable bladder (as

opposed to simply the inflation of the bladder, for example) retracts tissue from one of the opposed surfaces. There is no basis in the original disclosure for the feature defined in claims 15 and 18 since the original disclosure does not indicate that the surgical instrument is fixed to the retractor.

Claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are confusing and inaccurate for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 1, 4-9 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Matthews et al. (3,253,594). Matthews et al. disclose a cannula (the trocar described in col. 4, lines 39-47) and a retractor including shaft 16 that has a first lumen 56 therethrough and inflatable bladder 18 attached to a distal end of the shaft 16 and extending distally thereof, the inflatable bladder 18 including a opening extending therethrough (the opening through which instrument 12 passes) such that a surgical instrument 12 may traverse the first lumen 56 and the opening thereby entering the working space. The bladder 18 is inherently capable of retracting opposed surfaces of a bone

joint since the inflation of the bladder would inherently apply an outward pressure against the opposed surfaces to retract them. Alternatively, it would have been obvious that inflatable bladder 18 is capable of retracting opposed surfaces of a bone joint for the reasons set forth above. As to claim 4, bladder 43 is eccentrically shaped or mounted on the shaft as indicated in col. 3, lines 9-19. As to claim 5, note col. 2, lines 41-43. As to claim 8, portion 38 may be considered to be part of the shaft. This portion 38 of the shaft is rigid.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews et al. (3,253,594). Matthews et al. fail to disclose a viewing scope. However, Matthews et al. teach that member 12 can be any one of a number of devices, one of which can be used for taking photographs of interior portions of the peritoneal cavity (col. 2, lines 49-53). It is old and well known in the art that a viewing scope should be part of a device for taking photographs of interior portions of the body apparently in order to obtain the advantage of viewing the tissue being photographed. It would have been obvious to use a viewing scope as the Matthews et al. member 12 in the so that it too would have this advantage.

Application/Control  
Number: 10/752,933  
Art Unit: 3731

Page 5

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4704. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

mht



MICHAEL THALER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3731